

**REMARKS**

Claims 8, 9, 19, and 21-23 are pending in this application.

Applicant has amended claims 8 and 19, and has canceled claims 1-7, 10-18, and 20. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

In light of Applicant's election of claims 8, 9, and 19-23 for prosecution on the merits, Applicant has canceled nonelected claims 1-7 and 10-18. Applicant reserves the right to pursue nonelected claims 1-7 and 10-18 in a timely filed divisional application.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Liu et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2003/0201162 A1). Applicant has amended independent claim 8 to specify that the claimed system includes a detector for detecting light that is steered toward a specific die area on the surface of the wafer and reflected from the surface of the wafer, with the reflected light being detected by discrete detection regions arranged to cover selected locations that are part of the specific die area on the surface of the wafer. The system disclosed by *Liu et al.* detects light received from the plasma, rather than light steered toward a specific die area on the surface of the wafer and reflected from the surface of the wafer. Further, the system disclosed by *Liu et al.* includes sensors arranged to monitor optical emissions from the plasma from different regions of the plasma. In contrast, the claimed detector includes discrete detection regions arranged to cover selected locations that are part of the specific die area on the surface of the wafer. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, the *Liu et al.* reference does not disclose each and every feature of the system defined in claim 8, as amended herein.

Accordingly, independent claim 8 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Liu et al.* Claim 9, which depends from claim 8, is likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Liu et al.* for at least the same reasons set forth regarding claim 8.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matsuzawa et al.* (Japanese Patent Publication No. 2001-93885) in view of *Bret* (U.S. Patent No. 5,305,082). Applicant has amended independent claim 19 to include the features specified in original claim 20, as well as to specify that each detection end of the plurality of detector optical fibers is directed toward a separate area of a specific die region such that the plurality of detector optical fibers is arranged to cover the specific die region. Neither the *Matsuzawa et al.* reference nor the *Bret* reference discloses or suggests either the features specified in original claim 20 or the arrangement of the detection ends of the detector optical fibers to cover a specific die region of a wafer. Thus, for at least these reasons, the combination of *Matsuzawa et al.* in view of *Bret* does not raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the subject matter defined in claim 19, as amended herein. Accordingly, claim 19 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Matsuzawa et al.* in view of *Bret*.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of *Liu et al.* in view of *Matsuzawa et al.* As discussed above, Applicant has amended independent claim 19 to specify, among other things, that each detection end of the plurality of detector optical fibers is directed toward a separate area of a specific die region such that the plurality of detector optical fibers is arranged to cover the specific die region. Neither the *Liu et al.* reference nor the *Matsuzawa et al.* reference discloses or suggests detector optical fibers arranged to cover a specific die region of a wafer. Thus, for at least this reason, the combination of *Liu et al.* in view of *Matsuzawa et al.* does not raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the subject matter defined in independent claim 19, as amended herein.

Accordingly, claim 19 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Liu et al.* in view of *Matsuzawa et al.* Claims 21-23, each of which depends from claim 19,

**Application No. 10/625,243**  
**Amendment dated January 10, 2006**  
**Response to Office Action mailed August 10, 2005**

are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Liu et al.* in view of *Matsuzawa et al.* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 19.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of claims 8, 9, 19, and 21-23, as amended herein, and submits that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. LAM2P426).

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.



Peter B. Martine  
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
(408) 749-6900  
**Customer Number 25920**